HERALD OF FREEDOM.

"I enter into no compromise with Slavery. I am for Justice, in the name of Humanity, and according to the Law of the Living God."

Vol. 7. No. 3. CONCORD, N. H., FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 1841. Whole No. 289.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
NEW-HAMPSHIRE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY:
OFFICE, LOW'S BLOCK, MAIN STREET.

JOHN B. FRENCH, Publishing Agent;
☞ To whom all remittances are to be made, and all letters addressed, relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper.

TERMS.—One dollar and fifty cents per annum.

No paper will be discontinued until arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the Publisher.

Persons receiving the Herald will be considered subscribers until they order otherwise.

Communications to be directed to N. P. ROGERS, Concord, N. H.

☞ *Postage ought to be paid in all cases.*

Postmasters can forward money free from expense, at the request of any subscriber.

COMMUNICATIONS.

EXETER, Feb'y 26, 1841.

Pro-Slavery Sects.

My Brother: An Anti-Slavery Convention for Rockingham County, held in this place, closed last evening, at 10 o'clock. It held two days and evenings, in the Methodist house. A resolution was introduced touching the pro-slavery, sectarian organizations of this country—called *Christian churches*—and discussed one whole day and two evenings, with deep and increasing interest. A numerous assembly each evening. One clause of the resolution asserted the duty of abolitionists towards all such pro-slavery organizations in these words—

"*And duty to God and the slave demands of abolitionists that they should forthwith renounce them as Christian bodies.*"

The Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, and Congregational denominations, were arraigned and pronounced to be *pro-slavery*.—Several thousand of human beings are claimed by them as property, and used as such. Concubinage, robbery, and murder are in them—in the persons of several thousands of men-stealers, who are fellowshipped by these bodies, as christians and christian ministers;—and the Congregational sect aids and abets these denominations in these atrocious crimes.

Two great questions came up. (1.) Do we countenance and sustain slavery by joining the Presbyterian denomination as a christian church, or by continuing in fellowship with it as such—while we know that denomination holds many slaves and fellowships slave-owners, and slave-*breeders*, as christians and christian ministers?—While it hugs slavery in its bosom and opposes all efforts to turn it out? (2.) Ought we to apply the term *Christian* to slavery, or to any individuals or combinations of individuals that owns or breeds slaves? The opponents of the resolution maintained that it was not right to call a slave-holding *individual* a christian—but that it is right and duty to join slave-holding and slave-trading organizations as *christian churches*,—and that, if we are in such organizations, it would be a violation of duty to God and man to renounce them as christian bodies. It was argued that it would be wrong to refuse to acknowledge the Methodist, Presbyterian and Baptist denominations as christian churches, merely because they hold, keep, and sell slaves. Many reasons were given why it would be wrong to renounce them as christian churches.

(1) Christ did not renounce the Jewish church. (2) Because we must be in these slave-breeding organizations or in the world. Not to join them as christian churches, is to be ranked with the world—with Infidels, atheists. Let me be with infidels and atheists, out of these pro-slavery bodies, rather than with men-stealers, adulterers, and kidnappers, in them. (3) Ought not to discuss the subject of joining or renouncing these pro-slavery organizations in anti-slavery conventions.—Did not belong to anti-slavery to meddle with them. (4) All would think we renounced them from spite. (5) Had never known any one to prosper that renounced christian fellowship with these pro-slavery organizations. (6) Destroy our influence in and out of these pro-slavery organizations, to renounce them as anti-christian. (7) To join these pro-slavery sects, and continue in them as christian churches, is not a pro-slavery position. (8) No dishonor to Christ to say that He regards a slave-holding and slave-trading sect, as his church—his visible kingdom. But to excommunicate these slave-holding organizations from christian fellowship is to excommunicate the church of Christ—the pillar and ground of the truth. These and other arguments were urged against renouncing these slave-holding organizations as christian bodies.

In favor of the resolution it was urged that our anti-slavery influence upon these pro-slavery corporations, and upon all men, would be greatly increased by formally excommunicating them from our christian fellowship. That to call a slave-breeding corporation a *christian church*, is to make Christ the Prince of men-stealing—and to make his holy religion a scorn and a hissing. It was urged that it was a practical rejection of Christ, to say that a *slave-holding* sect—as the Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, &c., is a church of Christ. It was urged that the kingdom of God, is not a *corporation*—much less a slave-holding one. That Christ dwells not in pro-slavery, sectarian corporations, but in individual regenerated hearts.—THAT MEN ARE NEVER ENGRAFTED INTO CHRIST BY CORPORATIONS—BUT BY INDIVIDUALS. Therefore, though not in a man-stealing corporation, we may be in Christ—but we cannot be in Christ and consent to be constituent parts of a slave-holding corporation.

To show that all who consent to remain component parts of slave-holding, sectarian corporations, the following illustration was given:

Suppose on the sea-board, in the town of Rye, in Rockingham County, there is community of *sheep-stealers*—one hundred families. They all live by stealing *sheep* from Exeter, Stratham, Greenland, Hampton, and other towns in the county. *Sheep*-stealing is the business of all. They have a church and a minister. The meeting-house is built by *sheep*-stealing—the Bibles, hymn-books, and communion service, bought by *sheep*-stealing. The salary of the minister is paid by *sheep*-stealing—and the minister is himself a *Reverend* sheep-stealer; and the church is a *sheep*-stealing corporation. Will you call that corporation a *christian* church; and that minister a christian minister? But this Reverend *sheep*-stealer is a member of the General Association of New Hampshire. He meets with the Association—is asked to pray, preach, and make speeches at anniversaries, and is a member of the Missionary Board, and helps manage the benevolent institution. William Williams, of Exeter, Edwin Holt, of Portsmouth—who bought and sold the image of God, in a woman—and Daniel J. Noyes, of Concord, invite him to preach for them. This Reverend *sheep*-stealer is fellowshipped by the Association as a christian minister—the members of the Association knowing that he is supported and lives by *sheep*-stealing. That *sheep*-stealing corporation is fellowshipped as a *sister* church by the General Association—and the members of it are received to communion and membership by letter, and the members of other churches are dismissed and recommended to that by letter.

Now does not the General Association of New Hampshire stand before Heaven and earth in a *sheep*-stealing position?—and do they not spread the sanctions of christianity over *sheep*-stealing? Is not the General Association a *sheep*-stealing Association? Does not every *man* who consents to be a member of that Association and to fellowship it as a christian association, stand in a *sheep*-stealing position? No matter how loudly and earnestly he may protest against *sheep*-stealing, so long as he consents to remain a constituent part of a *sheep*-stealing Association, and to fellowship it as christian, he is in league with *sheep*-stealing and is in a *sheep*-stealing position. The only way for the *Anti-Sheep*-Stealing members of the association to get out of their *sheep*-stealing position is, to renounce the association as a christian body, while it fellowships that *sheep*-stealing minister and church as christian. If the Methodist denomination *fellowship* that *sheep*-stealing minister and church as christian—or the General Association to which they belong, as a christian body—that sect is a *sheep*-stealing sect. So would all other denominations be. They would all stand in a *sheep*-stealing position, and could do nothing to abolish *sheep*-stealing while in it.

Substitute MAN for *sheep*—make that *supposed* community of sheep-stealers in Rye, the *real* MAN-stealing community of the South—that supposed *sheep*-stealing church, the real MAN-stealing churches of the South,—and that supposed Reverend *sheep*-stealer, the real Reverend MAN-stealers of the South.—Consider these MAN-stealing corporations and ministers of the South as constituent parts of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist sects—and fellowshipped as christian ministers and churches; and consider the Congregational and all other denominations as recognizing and fellowshipping these MAN-stealing sects as *Christian* organizations; and you have the real position of all our sectarian organizations, and of the individuals that join them and continue in them as christian churches.

Suppose Daniel J. Noyes, and church, were slave-*owners*, slave-*breeders*, and slave-*traders*; and the Methodist sect fellowshipped them, and the General Association to which they belong, as *Christian*.—Would not the position of that sect, and all who belong to it, be a slave-holding position?

Shall we continue to fellowship SECTS composed in part of slave-*owners*, slave-*breeders*, and slave-*traders*, as christian sects,—and thus cast the sanctions of Christianity over the foulest crimes? To this are abolitionists now called. Men and women are bound to these slave-*breeding* and slave-*trading* sects, like victims to the car of Juggernaut. Sectarianism is now the giant foe of Anti-Slavery. We must emancipate ourselves from the despotism of pro-slavery sects, before we can work efficiently for the slave.

H. C. WRIGHT.

Dr. Batcheller, and the Rev. Mr. St.Clair.

We hardly feel warranted in publishing the long controversy between our friend Dr. Batcheller, and New-Organization's Agent—on account of its great length and its personal and local character. But we owe, and our readers too, something to Dr. Batcheller's feelings—as a staunch friend of the cause in Cheshire County—where Anti-Slavery has comparatively but little sympathy—the people being more aristocratic than in the other counties; and as the man who had the fidelity and intrepidity to stand up alone for the down-trodden cause in the State House, when almost the whole body of legislators trampled it under foot amid their own filthy *cuds*. But a stronger reason is that he has been denied a hearing in the Abolition Standard, where St.Clair was allowed to utter his whole will and desire against him. Now were we the Doctor, we should let St.Clair go for what he would fetch,—and not answer him according to his, &c. But it may develope New-Organization somewhat to give the whole matter a place in the Herald of Freedom. We publish this week, St.Clair's attack, and the Doctor's reply—St.Clair's rejoinder, and the Dr.'s answer, which was denied a place in the Abolition Standard, next week.

[*From the Standard of Dec.* 18.]

To the Abolitionists of the County of Cheshire.

DEAR BRETHREN,—Having learned that many false and injurious impressions, in relation to the course of Mr. St. Clair, the Anti-Slavery Agent in this County, and Rev. Mr. Grosvenor, while the former was in this place, have been made in a secret and underhanded manner, upon some of your minds, which, if believed are calculated to impair confidence in these brethren, and do injury to the Anti-Slavery cause, we have thought it incumbent on us to address you in this public manner on the subject to remove these impressions.

On the 30th of Oct., Mr. S. C. lectured in this place and took up a subscription in aid of the N. H. Abolition Society. There were few present, and among them a sanguine devotee of the Garrison sch., who it is said has taken unremitting pains to prejudice the friends in the County against Mr. S. C. *We* also were present at the meeting. We know what was done. *We* are the persons who subscribed. *We* know whether we were deceived—whether we were induced to subscribe by false pretences—whether our subscriptions have been diverted from the object for which they were made—and whether we are dissatisfied with the course of Mr. Grosvenor and Mr. S. C. in relation to them, and we do assure you that such is not the case.—The leading facts in the case are briefly these:

Mr. S. C. in his lecture, assigned the reasons for a new anti-slavery organization,—set forth its designs, prospects and needs,—asked of its friends a subscription in aid of its efforts,—remarked that he had been requested by Mr. Grosvenor, to state that, more than a year ago, a pledge of ten dollars had been made by himself and Dr. Batchelder, to the old State Society, which ought to be redeemed. He very heartily seconded Mr. G's wish to redeem that pledge, stating in substance, that however much we might disapprove the recent course of that Society, and be disinclined to aid it in future, yet we ought to pay in good faith what we had pledged, and he hoped it would be promptly done; that Dr. Batchelder and his family had paid something during the year—he thought about five dollars—which, as far as it went would of course go to liquidate the pledge; but there would still be about five dollars due; and that it ought to be paid without delay.

Three of us then circulated papers through the house for subscriptions, with the expectation (except two of us, who thought it was all to go to the new Soc.) that, after deducting what had been paid by members of our society since it was made, the ten dollar pledge would first be paid to the old society, and the remainder would go to the aid of the N. H. Abolition Society. Dr. B. immediately arose, as we suppose, to prevent people for subscribing,* and asked leave to speak ten minutes. Mr. S. C. replied, that, as soon as the subscription was taken up, he should have all the opportunity he desired. He, however, insisted on speaking then, complained of being gagged, stated the points he wished to speak to, and continued to keep up an opposition till the subscription was close, or rather defeated, when he commenced his speech in reply.—He so nearly effected his object, that except from those who circulated the papers less than two dollars were subscribed.

As a dispute had arisen in the meeting in relation to the appropriation of the subscription, some understanding that the above pledge was to be redeemed out of it, and others that it was not, (the sum having been pledged without a written paper,) and as it was found on examination the next morning, that less than five dollars had been subscribed, Mr. S. C. with the advice of a few friends, wrote the paper at the end of this article, as to the meaning, object appropriation of which there could be no missunderstanding, called on us personally, desirous, if we saw fit, to transfer our names, and increase the sums subscribed. We did so; and whether to transfer our names to blank papers which bound us to nothing, to a plain subscription paper, which obliged us to pay more, and in a particular way, and entirely to throw up those former papers, were right or wrong, *we* not *he*, did this act. *We*, at his request, revoked our former pledges, and renewed them on a larger scale. We *supposed* we had a perfect right to do so; but whether we had or not, no one but ourselves is accountable for the act.

With regard to our names being transferred from paper to paper, and the object to which the subscription has been, or is to be, applied, *we*, are satisfied—and as we are the parties who *made* and *paid*, or *are to pay* it, if *we* are satisfied with Mr. S. C.'s course, we do not know who is entitled to complain. It was our own voluntary act, and we alone are the parties concerned. We made the pledge for the purposes set forth in the paper; if it shall be applied in that manner, our expectations would have been met and our designs accomplished.

We desire you to remember, that by the new subscriptions, more money is secured to the old anti-slavery society, than by the old subscriptions;—and also, that though Mr. Grosvenor has been charged with having violated his pledge to that society (which was but five dollars,—he and Dr. Batchelder having pledged ten) he and his wife have subscribed that sum. They have paid it; and it will be handed over, on the conditions required, as soon as it can be done without expense. We desire you also to observe, that not a cent of this subscription is due till May next, and that very little of it was paid when it was made. How could Mr. S. C. misapply the money before it had been received.

We conclude by remarking, that we entertain little doubt, that the false impressions and misrepresentations which we have labored in this article to remove, have originated in wounded pride and a disappointed ambition to rule us. The individual from whom they have proceeded, is an uncompromising enemy of the New-Hampshire Abolition Society, which we support. He did all he could when Mr. S. C. was here to cripple the influence of his labors and prevent his obtaining a subscription. At the late annual meeting of the county society at Keene, we are told, that he called a number of leading, influential abolitionists together, and exerted himself to the utmost, to make them believe Mr. St. Clair and Grosvenor had abused and injured him in relation to our subscriptions; but was very careful not to notify either of the persons, whose character he was laboring to destroy, to be present to hear his accusations or to defend themselves. We regard his course in relation to this subject, as being extremely unfair and unjust; and we trust you will not withhold from those brethren your unshaken confidence, till you see them face to face with their accuser, and hear them in relation to all his charges.

William Jones, Nancy L. Jones,
James Farrer, Eliza Farrer,
William Farrer, Sophia W. Grosvenor,
Eliza A. Fay.

---

* When the papers were circulated, he declined subscribing; but on being assured that the above mentioned pledge was to be paid, remarked that he would subscribed liberally. After the meeting dispersed he subscribed the sum of fifty cents; and subsequently assigned as a reason for subscribing no more, that he feared more than sufficient to redeem the pledge, would be obtained, and would go to the new Society.

The following is the paper to which the foregoing names were transferred, and to which all the others were afterwards added except John T. Wiswall, who yesterday added to his former subscription. He signed 12 1-2 cents of the evening of Oct. 30th, which was put on this paper, by the advice of his friends. He has since approved the act, by tripling the sum.

SUBSCRIPTION PAPER.

We, the undersigned, hereby agree to pay into the treasury of the New-Hampshire Abolition Society, or to some one of its authorized Agents by the first of May 1841, the sums set against our several names.—But said Treasurer or Agent is to pay over five dollars of the same to the Treasurer of the New-Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society, in payment of that part of the pledge, which was made by Rev. Mr. Grosvenor and Dr. Batcheller to said Society in 1839 for which Mr. Grosvenor is now holden; and he is hereby required, on condition of paying it, to have it receipted and acknowledged in the Herald of Freedom.

NAMES.		NAMES.	
Minot Farran,	$5.00	M. G. Grosvenor,	$5.00
William Jones,	3.00	H. T. Wiswall,	1.00
Asa Frost,	1.50	J. S. Sanderson,	1.00
James Farran,	1.00	J. Woodward,	50
A. Friend,	50	W. O. Whitcomb,	30
J. T. Wiswall,	37	Wm. Farran,	1.00
S.W.Grosvenor,	1.00	R. F. Farran,	1.00
Lois Brabrook,	1.00	Betsey Converse,	1.00
Sally M. Jones,	1.00	Nancy L. Jones,	50
R.F.Woodward,	50	A. Friend,	50
Mary Wiswall,	50	Nancy Farran,	50
H. N. Wiswall,	50	Eliza Farran,	25
Arvilla Farran,	25	Eliza Fay,	25
Abiah Dwinell,	25		

[*From the Standard of Dec.* 25.]

TO THE EDITORS OF THE STANDARD: As my character has been assailed in your paper, I ask the privilege of making a true statement of facts.

To the Abolitionists of the County of Cheshire:—I address you for the purpose of correcting the many gross misstatements contained in a communication under the above caption, published in the Standard of the 18th inst., signed by three males and four females.(1) One of the signers is Mrs. Sophia W. Grosvenor,(2) wife of the Rev. M. G. Grosvenor. Another is Miss Eliza A. Fay, a little girl perhaps 10 (3) or 12 years of age, living with Mrs. G. The others, excepting two, have been my neighbors during the whole period of my residence in Marlborough,—nearly 23 years. I ever have been their family Physician, and sympathising friend.(4) I wish it to be distinctly understood that my remarks are not particularly applied to the signers, Mrs. Grosvenor excepted.

It is my firm opinion that the Rev. M. G. Grosvenor is the author of that publication (5)—with the advice and consent of Rev. A. St. Clair as counsel. I have no reason to believe the signers of the publication had any hand in its composition. And why these innocent signers, five at least of the seven, could be importuned to aid Mr. Grosvenor in thus making public his enmity to me, I cannot imagine, unless it was that I might make a reply embracing facts which would counteract and put to shame the person whom I accuse of being the author.(6) Mr. St. Clair has the honor of presenting it, and urging its publication, in his own handwriting, but stated it was copied.

I will now make a statement of facts, most of which I can prove, and all of which I will make oath to. At the annual meeting of the New-Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society, in June, 1839, the delegates were desired to give pledges for their respective town societies to replenish an empty treasury, and sustain the Herald of Freedom. Mr. Grosvenor came to me, and asked me if I did not think we could give a small pledge in Marlborough? I told him I should think we might collect a small sum, and we agreed to

(*Continued on 4th page.*)

TRUTH TO MAKE YOU FREE.

NUMBER TWO.

THE REMEDY.

TRUTH—that truth recognized in the Declaration of American Independence, taught by the Lord Jesus Christ, and approved by the uncorrupted conscience of mankind—is the true and only effectual remedy for our country's slavery. Our Revolutionary fathers expressed it in this theoretical form: 'All men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.' Maintaining this, in respect to British oppression, they became freed from *that* oppression. Their descendants, by maintaining the same truth in respect to oppression from all sources, will free the nation from *all* oppression, completing what our fathers began. Our Lord Jesus Christ, the world's true Lawgiver, expressed the same truth in this preceptive form: 'As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' The same truth is declared by the common conscience of mankind, in that spontaneous approbation which its practice commands, and that reprobation which its violation calls forth, from all whose conscience is unseared and unsubverted, even the most rude and savage. Whenever this nation and the world are freed from slavery, it will have been accomplished by the power of this truth, triumphant over the lying spirit of oppression. Other influences may change the *form* of the disease, and the local seat of the pain and the plague-spot; as in the human body, literally, the form and special locality of the disease are changed, while it remains in the system, as painful and dangerous as before. What is necessary, is a remedy that will remove it, root and branch, in all its forms, localities and generalities, entirely from the whole system. The spirit of oppression, selfish assumption of superiority over fellow-creatures, prevails, a wide-spread plague, in all persons unsanctified by the spirit of truth. Slavery, American Slavery, is its consummated enormity, the most aggravated type of the moral distemper. Could it be dispersed by any influence but that of Truth, the essential malady would still subsist in some form in the social body. Literally, it is found of little or no benefit to have a bodily disease transferred from one part to another, or to have a local disease scattered abroad through the whole system. There is a cure, only when the virus is quite removed from the whole body, or neutralized by a proper antidote. If the slave-holder should to-day be constrained by a prospect of sordid gain, to emancipate his slave, he would enslave him again to-morrow, should the prospect change, so as to promise the most gain thereby. In this case, the same principle that enslaved at first, emancipates, and then enslaves again. Could there arise a political party, that from any motives should abolish slavery in our country, without establishing the truth of human rights, an opposite party, gaining the ascendency afterwards, might re-establish it. Or should the slave-holders of our country, be compelled by any force, except that of truth and conscience, to relinquish the present form in which they exercise the spirit of oppression, they would exercise it, to some extent, in some other form, like an unextinguished fire, that, suppressed at one point, bursts out in another.

But, under the circumstances in which slavery exists in this country, we can conceive of no manner in which there can be effected even a change in the *form* of its oppression, except by the influence of Truth—unless it should be by the sword of a foreign nation, or of the slaves themselves, or by the arm of Almighty vengeance. Truth can abolish it—can destroy it—can eradicate it—from this nation and from the world. And it is difficult to judge which of the two would be most blest in the removal of slavery by Truth's influence, the slave or the guilty, unhappy man that now holds the slave. Humanity, then, for the holder, for the slave, for all our countrymen, for ourselves, and regard to the glory of God,—claim of all who know the Truth, to spread it abroad through the nation, through the world.

THE TESTIMONY—the promulgation of the truth of the equal creation of all mankind, their unalienable right to liberty, and of the sinfulness of violating this right, especially to that consummated degree of claiming human bodies and souls as property—this testimony, with the Divine blessing, is the only influence promising an end to slavery, which shall be happy for the slaveholder as well as for the slave, and for the people of this nation. The truth is mighty, and if those who know it, and those who may know it, are faithful to their privilege and duty, it will triumph. The testimony must be borne clearly, earnestly, affectionately, constantly and widely. It must 'rise in solemnity,' and in the united utterance of millions of hearts, 'as the voice of many waters.' No heart that feels for suffering humanity should withhold its tribute, to the accumulating influence to be rolled as a torrent over the nation, such as the heart of man can not resist. Humanity, patriotism and common justice, as well as religion, forbid that any human being, capable of understanding and uttering it, should refrain from this testimony. No one can be excusable in refraining to bear it. He who does so is 'verily guilty concerning his enslaved, crushed brother,' whom he refuses to assist in delivering from the power of the spoiler. He is guilty of wrong towards the sinful and guilty oppressor, in withholding that rebuke, instruction and entreaty which might save a soul from death and hide a multitude of sins.

We call upon every reader of this little sheet—we entreat, in the name of humanity, and of the God of Mercy and Judgment—every man, woman, and child to whom our speech may come, to arise and speak for the dumb, the poor dumb slave, who cannot speak for himself.—Speak! for the slave's sake, for his oppressor's sake, for your own sake. Join your voice in the rising testimony, which, under God's blessing, is the only hope for a termination of slavery otherwise than by carnage and destruction.—Ministers of Christ, of all others, are bound most solemnly to bear this testimony. They cannot withhold it, and yet be indeed his ministers, for *his* is a ministration of mercy. Christians must declare it; for unless they have the spirit of Christ, they are none of his. They must let the light shine, that the deeds of darkness may be reproved. The patriot must speak it, for one sixth of his countrymen are in the worst bondage ever suffered, and the liberties of all the rest are encroached upon and threatened with subversion. The person of human feelings should testify it, for millions of human beings are sighing, groaning, writhing, under the horrid system of American slavery. The women of our land should plead it, for woman has a heart to compassionate suffering humanity, and hundreds of thousands of her sisters are in slavery, subject to all its hardships, rigors, tortures and pollutions. Children should proclaim and lisp it, for natural affection is not yet destroyed in them by the long hardening of the heart against its claims, nor by lying sophistries. All—all should stand up together in united testimony, that slaveholding is a heinous sin against God and an infamous crime against man, and ough therefore to be immediately abandoned. Together, they should unite and array themselves under the standard "PEACEFUL, RIGHTEOUS LIBERTY—EQUAL FREEDOM TO ALL, WITHOUT RESPECT OF PERSONS." Waiving all other differences and destinctions, here, hearts, hands and voices should unite in one work and one testimony. We call upon all to do so—we entreat, in the name of the bleeding, dying slave, in the name of religion, patriotism and humanity. Whose heart so hard as not to lend a voice and a hand? Who so dead to their own interests as to permit the deadly plague to continue in the body of the nation, while it is so rapidly leavening the whole with bondage and vice and ruin! The remedy is put into our hands. On us rests the responsibility of applying it.

Let the friends of this cause be ready to suffer and to sacrifice for its advancement. It is worthy the loss of reputation, ease and worldly substance. Let them deny themselves, for this is too great a work to be accomplished in ease. Let each make the slave's case his own and then do as he would be done unto. Much is to be expended—but the harvest will well repay the labor. Let us anew adopt the language of the Convention at Philadelphia, at which the American Anti Slavery Society was formed, seven years ago: 'We shall organize anti slavery societies if possible, in every city, town and village in our land; we shall send forth agents to lift up the voice of remonstrance, of warning, entreaty and rebuke; we shall circulate unsparingly and extensively anti-slavery tracts and periodicals; we shall enlist the pulpit and the press in the cause of the suffering and the dumb.—We shall aim at purification of the churches from all participation in the guilt of slavery—we shall spare no exertions nor means to bring the whole nation to speedy repentance. Our trust for victory is solely in God. We may be personally defeated, but our principles never. Truth, Justice, Reason, Humanity, must and shall gloriously triumph.'

The Lord hath crowned the efforts of abolitionists, thus far, with success. We have not room to sketch the effects produced already in the free States. It is ascertained that about *seven hundred slaves* have been emancipated, mostly within eight or nine years, their masters having been influenced to emancipate them by anti slavery publications and discussions. Probably as many more, unknown to us, have been made free. These are the first fruits, giving promise that the full harvest will be reapt, if the advocates of truth faint not. L. M.

SOMERSWORTH, March 3, 1841.

"'Tis Gain to Die."

DEAR ROGERS: Thomas G. Moses, aged 16, son of Theodore B., and Mary Moses, of this town, died last Sabbath, and was buried to-day. He was extensively known as a kind and noble-hearted youth—an affectionate son and brother—and greatly endeared to all who knew him.—Humanity had found a sanctuary in his young heart. The principles of Anti-Slavery had taken a deep hold of his sympathies. He had seen a beloved mother expelled from the church by REVEREND JOHN ADAMS, on account of her Anti-Slavery; and his heart was drawn nearer to her and to the slave whom she loved better than sect. The body was carried into the Orthodox house—from which his mother had been expelled. Great numbers assembled.—The house full. All seeming to feel that a loved one had been taken away. I was requested to be present and improve the occasion to the promotion of the principles which he loved. The following is the substance of my remarks, standing by the body of our departed young brother.

There is something sublime and beautiful in death—when viewed in the light of christianity, for "if we believe that Jesus died and rose again even so also them which *sleep in Jesus* shall God bring with him." To him who feels that Jesus is the resurrection and the life—death can have no terrors, the grave—no darkness, eternity—no uncertainty; for Christ is in him the hope of glory; and to die is gain. The bodily eyes close in death that the spiritual eye may open upon a cloudless, eternal day. The mortal tabernacle is taken down that the spirit may be invested with robes of unfading light. No, death has no terrors. This gloomy shroud is out of place. Our young brother liveth—in the bosom of his Father and his God.

I said death is sublime and beautiful—for at death the christian begins to live. Especially is death beautiful and sublime when God takes down the tabernacle which his own hand had reared for the immortal mind—for he takes away corruption to make room for incorruption—he takes away mortality to make room for immortality. But when man, with sacrilegious hands, presumes, for any cause, to destroy this splendid mansion of the Divinity—when man, by violence kills this body and lays it in ruins—then indeed is death horrible. It is unnatural—bloody—terrific. MAN—the image, the glory and vicegerent of God on earth—laid in ruins by man! MEN—the children of a common father, butchering each other and looking to their father to aid them in the bloody work! If we had the spirit of Jesus—could we do it? Jesus loved his enemies, and died for them. His love for his enemies was a love that "seeketh not her own." His prayer was—"Father spare mine enemies. Let me suffer and die." Had we his gentle, his long-suffering, heroic spirit, we never could lay violent hands on a brother, whatever he might do or threaten to us.

I have long since ceased to associate the presence of God with TIME or PLACE or outward observances. MAN, not time or place, reflects the image and glory of Deity to my heart.—When in the presence of a human being—whatever the color, sex, or condition—I feel that I am in the presence of Deity—for MAN is the living temple of God. MAN is a noble being—magnificent—honored of God. If this were an abiding sentiment with us—could we ever mutilate, strike down, and slay a man? Could we deface and destroy the representative of God? Beat the Divine Image? We should as soon dare to beat the Deity in person, as to beat him in his vicegerents. How all would abhor war if we did but associate the sacred and awful presence of God with MAN, rather than with time and place. How soon would all violence cease if man but had a proper respect and reverence for the image of God in man!

Where, too, were *Slavery!* Could we make merchandize of the Divine Image? Sell, for dollars and cents, the representative of Deity? No more than we could sell the Deity himself. No wonder our dear young brother was anti-slavery. He saw Humanity and Divinity—his own nature—imbruted. He felt for those in bonds as bound with them. He put himself in the slave's stead, and made their stripes, sorrows, and tears his own. He felt that his own nature was being sold, under the hammer of the auctioneer. He *felt*, and felt deeply;—and no wonder. The wonder is that any human being can look on slavery, and see man converted into a chattel, and not feel. May the anti-slavery mantle of our young brother fall upon all the youth in this place and nation.

There is no occasion so appropriate as this to consider the duties we owe to our fellow men—Over this body—but yesterday the habitation of an immortal soul—is the place, above all others, to consider the question of slavery, and war,—man-stealing, and man-killing. The one converts man into merchandize, at human will and pleasure—the other kills man, and blots him from the sum of human existence, at human will. It belongs to God to change the mode of our existence. He has called away our brother; and now his lips speak to us as they never spake before, and urge us on to greater efforts to stay the hand of violence and oppression—and so to live, that for us to *live* shall be Christ—then to die will be gain.

Again I say—"If we believe that Jesus died and rose again—even so also them which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him."—"Therefore comfort ye one another with these words."

H. C. WRIGHT.

We take occasion to express our heart-felt sympathy with our dear brother and sister Moses, in their touching bereavement, and our sense of the worth and loveliness of the young deceased. We had seen him but little—only during our visit at the time of the late convention.—But to see him was to love him. We vividly remember his sweet countenance, and his gentle demeanor. We felt, as we looked on him, that he could not long tarry in so rude a world as this. He had too delicate a nature—too fine a spirit—too much heart—a temper too unlike the world, to be at home in it. We beheld him as some beauteous bird, away from its native clime of sunshine, here awhile in our regions of winter—but soon to be gone. And he has flown. But his father and his mother will not deplore him with the selfishness of common mourning. They are too deeply enlisted in the cause of bleeding and heart-broken humanity, to have disposition or occasion for this. They have felt the bereavements of the smitten slave too keenly to be sensible to great extent of any infliction of their own—and "God will temper the wind" to them. He will soften His chastisement. It will only animate them the more in the sacred work they are engaged in—and in which they have now to take on themselves the share of the young coadjutor who has left them. God bless them, and imbue them more and more with His own spirit.—ED. HER.

CONCORD: MARCH 12, 1841.

Excommunication.

The time has been, when excision from the nominal church, was equal to sentence of death—not of the body only, but the soul. It was the king of terrors—and like death it reached all alike, from the throne to the beggar on the dunghill. Over all the miserable "christian" world, superstition and idolatry had enthroned a bloody Popery, whose sceptre of gloom shed woe on all the nations—and with dreadful "fear perplexed" the cowering "monarchs."—But that time has passed away,—and men now marvel that it ever existed. The power to kill the body has passed away, but to "destroy both soul and body in hell," the ecclesiastical principalities still claim the prerogative.—And the ungodly world, and the vassal religious profession which conforms to it, acknowledge the claim, and bow before it. Nominal Popery is down in New-England. Protestantism has succeeded to its supremacy. It burns down the convent of the powerless Catholic. And, it would burn the heretic as it does the convent, but for the democratic tendency and characteristics of the times. But though it does not burn and put to the rack, it persecutes and defames, and fixes the reproach of publican- and heathen-ism on its incorrigible offenders. But it can't kill the body.—Perhaps abolitionists have occasion to be thankful for that. We trust, however, there are many among them who would be faithful to incur its displeasure even on pain of stake and gibbet.

But nominal church will lose all her power. She is growing vile in the eyes of all the people. The openly ungodly see her corruptions, and rejoice,—though they are glad to use her penal influence in crushing reform and christianity. They despise her pretensions to sanctity. They see War, Slavery, Intemperance, Licentiousness, Mammon and all wordly-mindedness, entirely at home in her foul bosom.—She is become before their eyes, the "hold of every foul spirit and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird." She professes to be a "house of prayer," but the world behold her "a den of thieves." We denounce her as such, and come out from her, and bid defiance to her rotten impotency. She is the enemy of Christ, and the strong-hold of Satan. Christ is defrauded of His kingdom, by her Sectarian selfishness—her pride, ambition, and love of the world. She is Anti-Christ, and the Saviour can have but little regard for her Protestant and Catholic distinctions. She has no more faith in Him, as a mass, or of that "Charity" which surpasses "Faith and Hope," than an army, or a navy, or a seat of government.—She loves the Court House, and the State House, as well as she does the Meeting House—and the muster-field as well as she does either of them. A few short years will make all this palpable to all eyes, and make it "public opinion." Her clergy are the legitimate successors of Rome and Babylon—varying only in outer circumstances and fashion. They are a many-headed Pope, and they will miserably perish in the light of the coming millenium.

But we have little space to record our solemn convictions of her here. We mean to speak out more faithfully of her, from time to time, than we have done. We have wielded hitherto, only defensive weapons against her, as the haughty persecutor of the anti-slavery cause. We draw henceforth, the sword of assault, and mean, by the help of God, to press home upon her as Christian did upon Apollyon in Pilgrim's Progress. She is the grand enemy and barrier, in the way of anti-slavery, and it is our professed duty to assail her in her very camp. But we set out here only to give our own excommunicatory process, with a little corporate branch of her power located on the banks of the Pemigewasset. We cast that branch out from our fellowship, some two months ago. We should have done it as many *years* ago. In retaliation partly, and partly because we dared question its right to assign us our place of worship, and impose on us the support of a pro-slavery pulpit—it has proceeded in mock imitation of the gospel, to "cut us off."

One word of the character of this corporate body and its pulpit. It is a highly respectable, enterprising, thrifty, opulent corporation. Instead of the off-scouring of all things as once composed the church, it embraces the property and standing, and the rulers and centurions. Instead of the inmates of the abodes of poverty, the despised laborer, the carpenter's sons, and the like—it boasts the learned professions, men in the walks of rank, and office, and wealth,—merchants, lawyers, doctors, ministers, bankers, the Colonels, the Majors, and the Esquires. It is a highly influential, wealthy, and powerful church. It is any thing but a "feeble church"—as a band of *poor, humble* christians are styled, in "church" language. It controls one of the most elegant meeting houses in the whole State, and a pulpit that would do no discredit to the wealth and taste of the city.—And it has for some ten or dozen years been favored with a young minister of uncommon accomplishments and breeding;—not a profound scholar to be sure—but fluently familiar with the current theology of the day,—of a good deal of personal grace, and a thorough discountenancer of Anti-Slavery—Moral Reform—and the other unpopular agitations of the day, that disturb the tranquility of those that are reputably "at ease in Zion." His *performances* scarcely ever fall below mediocrity, whether he entertains the o'er-wearied devotion of his auditory by occasional dashes in Natural Science—or by a pro-slavery commentary on the New Testament, in *his* pulpit,—rides as chaplain to the regiment—or prays in the Court House for the blessing of the Prince of Peace on a session of malignant litigation. He always appears well. He was rather radically inclined in the Temperance cause—but subsequent experience taught him that moral agitation was dangerous, and he has prudently withdrawn his countenance from that hazardous reform. He is a member, we believe, of a Peace Society.—We remember contributing to his life-membership. But his *peace* principles are of that judicious character, which comport with a "well regulated militia," which would seem to be in accordance with the doctrine of "*wars and fightings.*" Lectures were delivered the last month, within stone's throw of his elegant meeting house, on Peace, Anti-Slavery, and Temperance. They were of the most thorough-going, faithful character, and of no ordinary ability. But the Reverend Mr. Punchard coolly turned his back upon them all, and the leading influences of his church organization with him.

A very considerable number of his "church" were once abolitionists,—some of whom remain so still,—but many of them, so far as we can learn, have waxed stone cold—their love of the cause of Humanity having perished under the stronger love of Sect. After enduring the frowns and the contempt of a pro-slavery pulpit and deaconship, they have succumbed, and now lick the foot that trampled them in the dust. Many of them, we have no doubt, voted for our excommunication—*because we would not support a pro-slavery pulpit.* We forgive them, of course—with all their more consistent pro-slavery brethren. Sisters we do not speak of—the goodly number belonging to this organization being held of no more account—or *count*, on any question that comes up to bind them, than the pew-doors, or cushions.

We give below the little excommunicatory correspondence. We give it to show the subserviency of poor individuals to their Sect and minister, and the malignity of these organized sectarian bodies, to the anti-slavery cause.

PLYMOUTH, Dec. 9th, 1840.

Brother Rogers: Your letter to the church committee was duly received. I write you, however, not as a member of that committee, who were appointed simply to correspond with absent members to ascertain their situation, &c., (1) but as an individual and aggrieved brother. (2) I have observed with deep regret the course which you have pursued for some time past.—I refer particularly to your breach of solemn covenant, in neglecting to assemble with this church on the Sabbath and at the communion table, and your general treatment of this church and pastor. (3) You have been in town a number of times since your removal to Concord, and once or twice if I remember correctly on communion Sabbaths. Yet you have almost uniformly absented yourself from our meeting, remaining at your boarding-house or going to another meeting where different religious sentiments are profest from those which this church regard as truth, (4) and have never to the best of my recollection, communed with this church since you removed your family to Concord, these things my brother, I have noticed with deep regret. You will remember I spake to you 6 or 8 months since upon this subject, you then said you had no intention to withdraw fellowship from us, and if I correctly remember you then stated that you felt no alienation from the church, and should you return to Plymouth to live you should meet with and commune with us as formerly, (5) but in your letter to the committee you seem to take an intirely different position, you now charge the church with being "an *unchristian body*" (6) and declare "that you can never commune with them again, or hear their minister while they and he retain their present position." Had you taken this ground when I conversed with you in the spring I should have felt obliged to commenced a labor with you immediately after the avowal of such sentiments. I feel brother, constrained to come to you and tell you your fault as Christ has directed in the 18th chapter of Matthew. (7) It does seem to me, that your course is anti-scriptural, and unjustifiable, if the pastor or either of the officers of the church have done any thing inconsistent with their profession, it was your duty to have commenced a labor with them agreeably to Christ's directions, but nothing of this have you ever done, (8) christian fidelity compells me to speak with plainness. You will not I trust, attribute to me any other than kind feelings toward you personally. (6) I certainly regard you as in error, dangerous error, and I come to tell you your fault, as you would be bound to tell me in a change of circumstances. Will you carefully and prayerfully consider this matter (10) Brother Rogers, as soon as convenient communicate with me on this subject. Remember, brother R. it is possible the church, and the pastor may be right, and you may be wrong (11) Hope you will be aided by the spirit of God to look at the subject as will be for your good and His glory. (12)

Your affectionate brother in covenant,

A. McQUESTEN.

P. S. You spake in your letter to the com. of publishing their letter and your own; I should consider it very improper to publish a private correspondence of this character (13)

(1) If that was the extent of their appointment, they signally transcended it,—for, as the reader will see, by reference to their letter in week before last's Herald—they made the same charges in it as are made in this epistle, of our being absent from worship and communion. Or is making that charge only done to "ascertain our situation, as an absent member," &c.!

(2) Yet he makes the same complaint in both capacities—viz., absence from worship and communion—which he "deeply regrets" in both.

(3) "*General* treatment of church and pastor" seem hardly to come within "*particular* reference,"—but no matter, provided all were *honest*. By the way, we never made a covenant, in our construction of it--to assemble with that church to hear whomsoever they might elevate up into their pulpit—or to go through with their ceremony of communion when we knew that nothing was farther from their hearts, than the smallest shadow of communion, or feelings of tolerable good neighborhood. The anti-slavery cause had embroiled the whole organization. They were as brotherly as John Quincy Adams and the slaveholders in Congress, when he read the Slaves' petition there—and not a whit more so. And it was an embroiling for which there was no cure. It was not within remedial reach of any discipline, or attempt at reconciliation. The least we could do was to stay away. It ought to have opened our eyes to the pro-slavery character of the combination itself, with its creed and compact, and unescapable fetters,—and have led us to shake ourselves free of it at once and forever. A covenant such as we are here accused of breaking, would be a wicked one to make, and wickeder to keep. It would be "honored in the breach," but not at all "in the observance."

(4) To the Methodist house—where abolitionists sometimes preached, and where we sometimes went,—"Where different religious sentiments are profest, from those which this church regard as truth"!—This developes one of the essential vices of these sectarian organizations. They *bind the individual to hold the sentiments which "the church regard as truth."* This is ultra Popery. We are deeply mortified that we ever wronged our humanity by entering such a combination. And we warn all our anti-slavery brethren to refrain their feet from combinations, which dictate what individuals may and may not believe—and where they may and may not go to meeting. They cannot maintain anti-slavery principles in such combinations. We admire at the servile insolence that can address to us such an admonition as this. Hear it again;—You have dared to go to a "meeting where different religious sentiments are profest, from those which this church regard as truth"! And for such an offence the church will visit you with her awful displeasure and doom! We thank our old neighbor *Deacon* McQuesten, for such a disclosure as this. It will help the people to learn the popish character of these sectarian Lodges. But we tell our friend we will go to what meeting we please, and stay away when we please;—and for doing as we please, we stand accountable to God and not to ecclesiastical corporations.—And so does he. We warn him to remember that *he* is accountable to *God*, and not to his Reverend Pastor, or the "Congregational Church." The Reverend Pastor cannot pardon *any* of his *transgressions*—or answer for them. He cannot safely *trust* in the Reverend Pastor, or in "the church." They are not God.—He must not *believe* in them—or *obey* them—or *worship* them,—or let them do his believing for him—as he evidently here would let the church do. He confesses that neither we nor himself can innocently differ in belief, with the majority of the Plymouth church. If he had charged us with going to a meeting where sentiments were preached different from what *we* believed true, there would have been less of Popery in the charge. But he complains that we ventured to hear what the *Church* did not regard as truth! Let all corporation-bound abolitionists reflect where they stand, and in what thraldom. They are bound to believe with the majority of their corporation. They are to be excommunicated if they differ from that majority. And this corporation they call the *Church of Christ*. We call it a "Synagogue of Satan." And we call it so with just all the emphasis that the English language and the human voice can afford it. Our anti-slavery friends in that corporation, know us well.—They know whether we mean what we say; and whether we generally have a reason to give for our opinions,—and whether we go to the bible for them, or elsewhere. They know whether they can regard our opinions as entitled to the consideration of ordinary opinions of men,—or whether, as their pastor told a Massachusetts minister, we are *insane*. And we repeat in their ears, deliberately and calmly, that in our conviction, the nominal church to which they belong, is a pro-slavery "SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN,"—which God will judge them for countenancing or belonging to. "He that hath ears to hear—let him hear."

(5) We told the deacon we had no thought of leaving the church. We had none then, It was our fault that we had not, for we knew them to be an "unchristian body." But it did not occur to us, as it has since, that their organization was a wicked one *in itself*. Instead of telling him that we should commune with them, we told him we should call them to account for their pro-slavery position, and give them no quiet till they repented and forsook it. We told him we should do *this*, as we had 'formerly' done,—only with much more fidelity. We have no recollection of saying any thing about *communing*, otherwise than by remaining of the organization. We confess we had not the fidelity then to think of quitting it. We now declare *no christian can consistently remain in it.*

(6) We did not charge it so—but we do *now*,—directly and deliberately. It no longer "*seems* to us, that we ought to have testified against it as an unchristian body," &c., as we said in our letter here referred to. We can say that it *is one*—in the light of the Holy Scriptures.

(7) We wish our readers would recur to that beautiful portion of Scripture, and read it carefully. It seems to us an injunction to Christ-like treatment of our brethren who injure us, to forgiving treatment and conciliation. It refers too, to cases of *personal wrong*. It comes after the parable of the lost sheep, viz. the wandering member of Christ's fold. The shepherd sought it till he found it. And after it comes the "seventy times seven" injunction of forgiveness, when poor Peter thought "seven times" would be a stretch of forbearance. And the parable of the 10,000 talent debtor, too. All showing the duty of forbearance and forgiveness, and the utmost endeavor in *love* and *good faith*, to induce the wrong doer to repent and be reconciled. How different that from one of these sectarian "labors"—these ecclesiastical corporation *law-suits*—these *holy writs of ejectment!* We denounce the whole of this litigious machinery, as of the devil. We do it as a christian, and here in the Herald of Freedom, as an abolitionist. It is pro-slavery machinery—and forbids the prosecution of the anti-slavery cause. And we make no attempts at being '*candid*' or '*solemn*.'—We use no canting—or daubing. We speak out plainly and bluntly. We denounce the whole of this ecclesiastical process against members for heresy and breach of covenant, as *of the devil*. If a brother has trespassed against a brother—that brother is bound to reclaim him, as far as it is possible for *Christianity* to effect it. And if he can't succeed, he is bound to regard him then, as Christ regarded Publicans and Sinners—to love him, and *labor for* him, not against him. Not to outlaw him and persecute him—as the Free Masons did Morgan; for the sake of keeping up the Sectarian Corporation. Our old friends at Plymouth hardly dare look at us, since they "*cut us off*," though they know in their souls that they are in the wrong, and we in the right.—*They know it.* And yet they *glower at us*, when we meet them, as if we had the leprosy, and they were afraid they should catch it. We pity and love the poor brethren.

(8) The Deacon forgets that we labored with them five successive days, and got nothing but contempt and ill usage. The poor minister treated us with all the impatient insolence of a task-master. "Labor!"—You might as well labor with His Holiness the Pope—on the unscripturality of Popery, as with one of these ordained clergymen, or deacons, on the wickedness of anti-abolitionism. They would regard it as treason in themselves to hear you,—treason against their own *awful solemnness*. The Deacon thinks we did not *labor*, because we did not "*take the steps*," as they say. We did not labor enough, to be sure—or in the right way. We ought to have charged them downright as the slaves of sect—and slaveholders and the abettors of the southern slave-driver. We acknowledge a deficiency of this sort of "*labor*."

(9) No, no—poor brother—not personal unkindness.—We never gave you the slightest occasion for any—nor you us. But you felt ill-disposed no doubt toward us, as the disturber of your organization, and a rebel against your minister. You *had* to feel unkindly—whether you would or not. But we make all due allowance.

(10) This is all sectarian cant.—It had better have been left out.

(11) This is the most you can say in their behalf,—and for this you would outlaw us, and if the times would warrant it, burn us at the stake.

(12) The old Papists on a certain occasion, were punishing a young woman for breach of *convent* (instead of "*covenant*") obligations, by bricking her up in a niche in a rock. Just as they were about to put in the last dash of mortar and the last brick, out of them uttered at the breathing hole—

"Sister—let thy sorrows cease,
Sinful sister,—part in peace!!"

(13) We have no "*private* correspondencies" with these brethren. It is time the world knew what was going on in these ecclesiastical *lodges*.—Anti-slavery members of other churches, ought to know it—and see what they are sanctioning. And besides, real christians do nothing which they wish to keep *secret*.

If our brother writes "as a private individual and not as a member of that committee," as he says he does, why does he say any thing about the committee correspondence? We will say one word further about it. We think it rather dishonorable, not to say dishonest, in brother McQuesten, after beginning a correspondence with us, as a committee-man, in behalf of the church, on a subject of difference between us and the church,—and getting an answer from us—which we specially sent them to have laid before the church, to join the minister in a plot to suppress that letter and keep the church from knowing what was going on—backing out from the controversy and starting a *private* labor, with intent to get rid of the *controversy and of us together!* We say this is not fair dealing. We know the letter to the committee was *at length* laid before the church.—After getting the "*labor*" under way, and after *we had told him our apprehension that they had suppressed it.*—But we have been credibly informed, and the facts all correspond with it—that it was resolved among them not to lay it before the church. But we dont care to criminate individuals—that is not our object. We want to show abolitionists that they must cut loose from these ecclesiastical pro-slavery corporations, and denounce them as pro-slavery synagogues, or they can do nothing for the liberation of the slave, or the abolition of the slave-system. Birney says truly in his late pamphlet that they are the "BULWARK OF AMERICAN SLAVERY."

CONCORD, Jan'y. 10, 1841.

Brother A. McQuesten;

I have opportunity to send an answer to your letter by Mr. Green. I intended to answer you sooner.

You will see, by recurring to the chapter in Mathew, to which you refer me, that you have no occasion to "labor" with me. There is no personal misunderstanding between us. "If thy brother *trespass against thee, &c.*" said the Saviour.

Besides, the matter you complain of, I was in correspondence with the church about, and they had,—*as a body*, called on me about it, through *yourself* as a committee man. I was surprised therefore to receive a letter from you privately about it. I am afraid you have not laid my letter before the church, as I requested you *expressly* to do,—but have concluded instead of that to start a process of excommunication against me. If this is so, you need not go through any forms. If you can obtain a vote of excommunication for a cause like that, I should not in the least deprecate it.

Regretting that you have felt inclined to write me in this way,

I subscribe myself your brother,

N. P. ROGERS.

PLYMOUTH, Jan'y 22, 1841.

Brother Rogers: I have received an answer to my letter to you on the subject of your breach of covenant. I do not feel at all satisfied with it, particularly with your *exposition* of the text of scripture referred to in your letter. If we take your ground, we could never discipline any member for breach of covenant;(1) as it is seldom against any one individual. For instance, suppose a brother should get drunk, there is no personal offence, but a whole church is offended; and according to our articles he cannot be dealt with until the private steps are taken:(2) and who is to take them, the *church*, if "*thee*," means the church, I think it will be difficult to go through with the discipline, for where will you find your, "one or two more," or if he will not hear them, where will you find "the church to tell it too?"(3) I think brother your mode of *construing* the passage will not satisfy the church of which you and I are members.(4) It certainly will not satisfy me. I therefore with the advice of the undersigned brethren, think it my duty to call on you the 2d time for the reason of your absenting yourself from us(5) &c., as set forth in my first letter to you on the subject, hoping you will receive it as from a brother who wishes you that joy and happiness which is the lot of those that walk in the ordinances of the Lord—blameless.

Your brother in covenant.

A. McQUESTEN.

P. S. An early is requested.

Brother Rogers: Dea. McQuesten having submitted to us the correspondence between you and him, and having asked our assistance in obedience to the rule, Matthew, 18th, 16th. We would ask you to examine carefully and prayerfully the cause of offence maintained in his letter, and see if you have not given him ground for the step he has taken. We believe you have: and we affectionately ask you to ponder the course you are pursuing in regard to your covenant obligations to this church, with which we are connected: assuring you that it would rejoice our hearts to know that you were sensible of your error and were disposed to return to the path of duty.(6)

We have seen your communication to the church, but how can we depart from the rule to which we have all assented and solemnly pledged ourselves to follow?(7)

Your brethren in covenant,

JAMES MORRISON,
WM. GREEN.

Plymouth, Jan'y 25, 1841.

(1) The beautiful proceedure marked out by the Saviour in the xviii Matthew, comprehending contentions and effecting reconciliation of brethren, was not given as forms of prosecution for "breach of covenant." The Saviour made no provision for such breaches. He gave no warrant for entering into what our professors call "covenant." These covenants are of worldly invention, as much as bank corporations. They are in derogation of Christianity, and Christ, of course, made no provision for their enforcement, any more than he did for our actions at law. And our professors might with the same propriety, bring an action of assault and battery under the xviii of Matthew, as one of their excommunicatory processes for breach of their corporation covenant. Christianity provides for one as much as the other. If any member violates the corporation covenant, the corporation should (if they could do any thing rightfully) call him right before the whole body, and punish him as the majority sees fit. But let them not profane any part of the gospel of Christ, by quoting it or using it in their proceedings. It is impiety.

(2) An offence against the church is not a private offence, and therefore no private steps need be taken. It is not called for. We do not mean to say not called for by the xviii of Mathew,—for these sectarian organizations have nothing to do with Matthew, or any other gospel. This, any free, careful, impartial reader of the Scriptures will readily see.—The church mentioned in Matthew, was not a sectarian organization. It was only the followers of Christ, united together by love to him—and when an offending brother would not hear the church, they did nothing to him.—They passed no vote. They were not organized as a corporate body, acting by majority. They did nothing at all to the offender, or about him—only endeavored to help the injured brother bring him into a state of reconciliation; and if they did not succeed, Christ tells the injured party to regard him as an impenitent man, and try to convert him, as he did the "heathen and the publican." This is the way we read the Scriptures.—"If he neglect to hear the church," says Christ, "let him be unto *thee* as an heathen man and a publican." The church had nothing to do about it farther.

(3) This theological reasoning savors a good deal of the logic of the Plymouth pulpit. But as we think the gospel has nothing to do with the subject matter of it, we answer it no farther. But we really wish our anti-slavery church members would examine their sectarian covenants in the light of the Scriptures; and we think they would then no more participate in them. And the anti-slavery cause would be freed of this pulpit and corporation opposition, so far as they are concerned. It is the most injurious opposition we meet with.

(4) That is because the church don't read the Bible. If they would read even Scott's Commentary, they would see, if we remember it correctly—that they ought to be satisfied. Though we do not hold to the inspiration of Doctor Scott.

(5) Mark the sectarian absurdity of calling for a reason, which I had given the writer most amply in my letter of Nov. 29.

(6) We really love brother Green, who wrote this endorsement, and give him credit for entire sincerity in his belief here, and for real good feeling towardi us. He is an old personal friend, and we highly esteem him. He would no doubt be glad to have us succumb, and bow to the sacredotal corporation—come under the yoke with himself, and never open our mouth on any moral subject again, to disturb the church. He feels obliged to wish so. In return for his affectionate request, we as affectionately, and we think more scripturally, ask him to read the chapter of Matthew he refers to, and see if he is not grossly misapplying it, under the influence of an implicit vassalage to a wicked, pro-slavery organization. We solemnly believe he is.

(7) You can't depart from it, dear brother Green, but by cutting loose from your unchristian obligation. You have offered up your conscience to the keeping of a majority, and your duty and responsibility to God you have merged in your sectarian combination. You can't be a christian and remain in it.—we name brother Green, because we see the endorsement, or "second step" is in his hand. Deacon Morrison signed it, *of course*, we presume.

PLYMOUTH, 7th Feb'y, '41.

Friends McQuesten, Morrison, and Green:

I received your "second step" letter of "labor" and send this to notify you that I have received it, and not to give you any answer to it.

I did not give friend McQuesten any explanatory answer to his "first step" letter, because I had already given him the fullest explanation and information on the subject of his complaint, in my letter to the church committee, of which he was a member. And I do not give you any now for the reason that you were all three members of that committee, and received that letter, to say nothing of the fact that you knew before, very well, on what account it was that I absented myself as I did. It seems, to me, friends, hardly honest to address me these formalities—calling for information which you already had—asking explanation, as if you needed it, when you did not—when I had given you explanation—all you could want, and in answer to your own call. It looks to me unbecoming members of a professedly Christian body, addressing one by the name of "brother." Does it not look like *pretence* and *dissembling?* Was it not in truth a mere formal process to carry into effect a predetermined excommunication? I use no such unmeaning forms with you. I am sorry you feel bound to with me. Could you expect that I should carry on this trifling with friend McQ. by repeating over to him what I had written to him as committee-man, or that I should give him a different explanation—or make an acknowledgment when I had done no wrong—or that I should do any of these to *you* after declining to—to him? Do you not feel in your hearts, my friends, that I am *in the right in all this, and yourselves in the wrong*—and that you are going through with all this formality in defence of *sectarian organization!* Let me say to you, kindly and plainly, that I apprehend you are driven to this course by the necessity you are under of compelling individual members to attend your meetings and pay your pulpit, (whether they can in conscience or not) in order to maintain your organization. You cannot maintain it, without you take from the *individual* all right and liberty of conscience. I say this to you in frank and friendly expostulation. Look at it and see if I am not right.

With entire kindness of feeling I am

Truly your friend,

N. P. ROGERS.

PLYMOUTH, Feb. 8, 1841.

To "the Congregational Church in Plymouth":

I have received by your committee a notice to attend your meeting to day, to answer to A. McQuesten's "labor." You must, it seems to me, have forgotten my letter to you of the 6th January—or have misapprehended its character, or you would not proceed to treat me as if we were now in church fellowship with each other and answerable to each other as church brethren. My letter was a withdrawal of my fellowship with you as a body—not a withdrawal from the church. This I do not suppose I could do by the terms of our church organization.

I do not wish to be formal or technical—but it seems to me improper that I should consider myself answerable to you, after my letter to you, and therefore I cannot attend your meeting in obedience to your notice.

I should be pleased to meet you, or any of you, in equal and friendly conference on the great question of Slavery, that has divided us, and to discuss it fully—publicly if you would consent, before all the People. Churches should have no secrets, I think. They are "a city on a hill"—the true church—"a candle on a candlestick, and not under a bushel."

Whether as you now stand in regard to slave holding, such a discussion could be profitably and kindly conducted on both sides, you can judge at least as well as I. If you please to meet with me on these terms, or any independent terms, publicly or otherwise, I will attend if I am well enough any day you may set, the latter part of this week. My health at present is hardly equal to it.

I am with perfect kindness,

Your friend,

N. P. ROGERS.

The decretal of excommunication we must defer for want of room, till next week. We will then give our readers other samples of excommunication. Every excision of an abolitionist, or of a pro-slavery corporation by him, is a sledge-hammer blow in the forehead of Slavery. Let them multiply.

CENSUS OF KENTUCKY. The Kentucky Gazette states the population of Kentucky as follows:

Total population,	777,353
Of this number there are slaves,	183,040
Free blacks,	7,302
Whites,	587,017
Scholars in schools,	26,953
Over 20, who cannot read,	38,733

Congregational Journal.

This paper, the successor of the deceased Panoply, differs from it, in the scholarship of the Editor,—and in a deeper and more alarmed (because more discerning) devotedness to Sectarianism, in place of Christianity. It differs not at all in settled enmity to the Anti-Slavery cause.

We are ashamed to see a man of Henry Wood's talents and *christian profession* devoting the commenced down-hill of life to the service of Christ's great enemy—SECTARIAN DENOMINATION; and the Devil's surest device for the delay (he can't *defeat* it)—*the delay* of the Saviour's reign on the earth.—His Journal is a desperate effort of the Congregationalism of New Hampshire, to check the Anti-Slavery enterprise—and to rescue the sinking denomination from going down, as it was, under the blockhead pro-slaveryism of the late Panoply. But we can hope nothing better from Sectarianism. Let it see if the learning, and the talent, and the cunning of the denomination, can avert its *inevitable* fate.

We have nothing to do, as an abolitionist, with Congregationalism—except so far as it is the enemy of anti-slavery. Seeing it to be this, we testify against it, as of the devil. And with the Congregational Journal we wish no quarrel. It has not openly assailed us—though we have not been undiscerning of it's position towards us and our cause. But we warn all abolitionists against sustaining it, or having its influence light upon the young minds connected with them. It is the advocate of Sectarianism and clerical domination, and not of pure, simple Christianity.

The Abolition Standard.

This slender periodical, the scorned handmaid of denomination—which despises it, although it is laboring to subject the anti-slavery movement to the dominion of Sect—among its March meeting efforts, puts forth a declaration, that the American Anti-Slavery Society sent John A. Collins to England, to solicit £2000 from the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. They did not send him to ask any money of that Society.

The Abolition Standard says further—He was not very cordially received on the other side of the water. We say that he *was*.

It says he is likely to come home without the money. We say it will be soon known *certainly* what money he comes home with—and see what the Standard will say then. "He made sweeping charges against the old Committee—which he will hardly wish to meet at home." The charges are true, and he will not have to meet them any where. They are well known to be true here. The attempted answer of the Committee, virtually admitted them to be true.

WEEKLY LIST OF REMITTANCES.

Davis Baker, Asa Walton, Amos Merrill, William H. Mayo, Benjamin Chase, Moses Chase, Benjamin Sargent, T. A. Stearns, H. Isaacs, Elisabeth Buxton, Joshua Lunt, Sophronia Willoughby, Phinehas N. Pratt, Samuel Cook, H. C. Fifield, H. E. Weston, Elias Richards, $1.50, each——George W. Rogers, John Dearborn, John A. Richardson, Sarah Freeman, Samuel Simpson $2.00, each——James G. Daw, Jonathan T. Dodge, Thomas Colby, Joseph Eells, M Worster, Sarah R. K. Wilder, Mehitabel Haskel $1.00, each——Leonard Cheeney $1.10——J. G. Hoyt $1.20——Royal S. Clark 1.25——John Blaisdel, $1.26——Rev. Geo. W. W. Thompson, $1.50——Ephraim Foster $2.05——C. H. Ober $2.04——Joshua Blaisdel $2.21——Rev. John Burden $2.08——Ezra Alden $3.00——Nathan Plummer 3.50—Benjamin Cheever, Weymouth Ladies' Emancipation Society, 4.10, each——Rebecca Wait 6.00.

Tobias Foss, E. C. Brown, Jewett Wiggin, $1, each.——Enoch M. C. Lane, Rev. Samuel Eastman, $2 00 each,——Cyrus E. Hardy, 1.50,——Ezekiel C. Rogers 1.86,——Albe Cady, 4.50,——John Todd, 2 62,——Lyman Knowlton, 0.75,——John Rogers, jr., 0.32,——Humphrey Brackett, 0.62,——Peter Kimball, 0.81.

TREASURER'S REPORT,

(For the month of February.)

Bradford—Ambrose S. Bracket 50 cts.,
New London—Josiah Brown 50 cts.,
Canaan—Liba Conant 1.00,
Hollis—Samuel Hayden 5.00, Jonathan T. Wheeler 5.00, Olive Henderson 12 cts., P. W. Collamn 50 cts,
Mason—Christopher Marden 1.00, J. E. Bacon 1.00, David Blood 50 cts.,
Exeter—Susan Folsom 1.00, Mary W. B. Smith 1.00, A Friend 50 cts., A Friend 50 cts., John Bordman Mead 32 cts., Hannah Swazey 25 cts., Benjamin Swasey 50 cts.,
Durham—Solomon Pendergast 5.00,
Mont Vernon—David Dutton 2.00,
New-Ipswich—George Sanders 5.00,
Francestown—Wm. Butterfield 50 cts., Hewins Fisher 25 cts,
Haverhill, Mass.—Sewell Jewett 5.00,
Danville—John Collins 25 cts., Aaron Quimby 50 cts.,
Kingston—Sarah Hall 50 cts., Nathaniel Cornelius Brown 25 cts., Arthur Tappan Brown 25 cts., Lloyd Garrison Brown 25 cts., Edmund Quincy Brown 25 cts.
Wilton—Zebediah Abbot 6.00, Timothy Abbot 2.00, Wm. Sheldon 2.00, Henry Abbot 3.00, Hermon Abbot 1.00,
Dedham, Mass.—Reuben H. Ober 1.00,

Payment of Shares towards the Old Debt.

Francestown—Alexander Everett 5.00,
Bradford—John Brown 5.00,
Antrim—J. M. Whiton 2.50,
Sanbornton—William Abbott 2.50.
Boscawen—William Chamberlain, 20 00.

A. WOOD, *Treasurer.*

Received into the Treasury of the *New-Hampshire Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society*, seven dollars—contributed by friends in Hill.

JOHN R. FRENCH, *Treasurer.*

The Concord Female Anti-Slavery Society gratefully acknowledge the receipt of twenty-six dollars, twenty-five cents—by the hands of Mrs. Hannah Wilbur—contributed by anti-slavery women of Dover, to aid in redeeming the pledge of the Society to sustain the Editorship of the Herald. The names of the contributors are subjoined.

Caroline C. Osborne 5 00, Hannah Wilbur, Elizabeth Osborne, Mary P. Osborne, 3.00 each; Mary Rathbone, Nancy Davis, Elizabeth Watson, Caroline Estes, Abigail S. Folsom, Hannah B. Alden, Sarah M. Smith, Frances Freeman, 1.00 each; Lydia Hanson, A Friend, Rebecca Palmer, Elizabeth Alden, Sophia Wyatt, Lucy Flagg, Sarah Sargent, Abigail Sargent, 50 cts. each; Mary R. Osborne, 25 cents.

SARAH S. PILLSBURY, *Treasurer.*

POETRY.

"They cast him out."

We copy the following from the National Anti-Slavery Standard, with the pertinent prefatory remarks of the resident Editor. In addition, we would observe that they aptly portray the pro-slavery persecutions going on in some of our own sectarian organizations. For example—the excommunication of the christian abolitionists of Bradford; of David Dutton, of Mont-Vernon; of Mary Moses, of Somersworth; of Amos Wood, John B. Chandler, Esther Currier, Louisa Wood, and Sarah Pillsbury, of the South Church in Concord,—"cast out," without the slightest *pretence of suspicion upon their Christian character*,—and of many others.—Surely these churches are ripening for overthrow.—They are ejecting the "righteous," who might if remaining among them delay the visitations of Heaven. Let them continue it. They are *wicked organizations*. We trust every abolitionist will flee from them. We believe some signal catastrophe awaits them. We are not conversant with Miller's prognostications of the coming destruction of the world by fire—new near at hand.—But we should not be at all surprised at the burning of the ungodly MORAL world, in the consuming fires of Christianity, by 1843,—these ungodly ecclesiastical masonic lodges among the rest;—for if any thing is fuel for that fire, it is these repositories of Sectarianism. "Come out of her, my people"—be no longer "partakers of her sins—that ye receive not of her plagues"!

The Excommunicated.

The following lines were published in the English Methodist Magazine for June, 1834. They were written in allusion to the case of the Rev. JOSEPH R. STEPHENS, a Methodist minister, who was suspended from the exercise of his ministerial functions, for no other reason than because he became the Secretary of an Association which had for its object *the dissolution of the unholy alliance between Church and State!* In the resolutions of the clerical body which deposed him, his conduct in accepting the office alluded to, and his addressing public meetings called for the same object, is discribed as "inconsistent with those sentiments of *respect* and *affection* towards the Church of England, which the Methodist Connexion has, from the begining, openly professed, and honorably maintained." The poetry is not inapplicable to the state of our own country at the present time, when the church is excommunicating her best and holiest members for the *crime* of following in the footsteps of their Lord and Master, by attacking the popular sins of the day.—*Ed. Standard.*

They cast him out—they cast him out,
Though called of God to preach
The glorious Gospel of his Son
To all within his reach.
He preached that Gospel faithfully,
He preached it round about;
And thousands flocked to hear him preach:
And yet they cast him out!

They cast him out—*who* cast him out?
Some wicked men, who felt
The lacerating force of truth,
When he its arrows dealt?
Alas! the foe was from within,
Instead of from without:
The servants of the Lord themselves
Cast the Lord's servant out!

They cast him out—*why* cast him out?
Perchance he was unsound:
Perchance he bade believers sin,
That grace might more abound;
Perchance upon Christ's deity
He threw insidious doubt.
Oh, no! he was quite orthodox
And yet they cast him out!

They cast him out—why cast him out?
It may be, though his creed
Was scriptural, 'twas neutralized
By some unrighteous deed:
Perchance a bad example put
Good precepts to the rout.
No; he was blameless in his life:
And yet they cast him out!

They cast him out—why cast him out?
It may be that, though pure
In conduct and in creed, his *gifts*
The test would not endure.
Derision! from a thousand tongues,
Reply with stunning shout!
To talents five he'd added five:
And yet they cast him out!

They cast him out—why cast him out?
Why staid the blest career
Of gifts so rare, of hands so clean,
Of doctrine so sincere?
Who, if he could, would stop the rain
That puts an end to drought?
His words were drunk by thirsty ears;
And yet they cast him out!

They cast him out—ay, cast him out:
And what was his offence?
"The kingdom of the Lord," he said,
"Ariseth not from hence!"
But though the grand imperial truth
Pervades "the book" throughout,
His brethren would not have it so,
And therefore cast him out!

They cast him out—they cast him out!
E'en old disciples heard
With profit much, and much delight,
His comments on the word;
While hearts as nether millstones hard,
And unbelievers stout,
Confessed the Spirit's power in him:
And yet they cast him out!

They cast him out—they cast him out!
The lips that he had taught
The song of souls redeemed to sing,
Their pastor's loss besought—
Those, and whom, erring, he reclaimed,
Whom he resolved in doubt,
And whom, in grief, he comforted:
And yet they cast him out!

They cast him out—they cast him out!
Yet one above the rest,
Of wisdom, and integrity,
And Charity, possest,
Dissuaded. But his pearls were thrown
Beneath a swinish snout:
Like wolves tenacious of their prey,
They sternly cast him out!

They cast him out—they cast him out!
But, not with his content,
Forbade him, under pains, to call
On sinners to repent.
They surely knew not what they did,
(So candor bids us doubt)
Who silenced an evangelist,
Who cast their brother out!

They cast him out—*they* cast him out;
But this is all his care,
The approbation of his God
With God-like men to share:
And him who of a conscience pure
The witness bears about,
God, though his fellow-mortal may,
"In no wise will cast out!"

J. M. H.

(*Continued from 1st page.*)

pledge Marlborough for $10, and if we could not collect the whole, to divide and pay the remainder equally out of our own pockets. The pledge was mutual. Several months after, I stated to Mr. G. that I thought we had better call a meeting, and collect our pledge. Mr. G. replied, that he thought we ought not to pay it—that he understood that the State Society were to send us an agent to lecture, &c., but that none had been sent. He enquired if I did not so understand it? I said no; I considered our pledge a voluntary gift.

A short time previous to the annual meeting in June, 1840, I again directed his attention to our pledge. He repeated the same story, and said they could not collect the money, because they had sent us no agent. I found on enquiry at Concord, that no terms were attached to the pledges—that my impressions were correct.

I will here introduce a statement signed by respectable citizens(7) of Marlborough, of unblemished characters—one of whom is one of the select-men of the town. They have offered to make oath to the truth of the statements.

The undersigned solemnly affirm, that the following is a true statement of facts, in regard to the transactions which took place at an Abolition meeting held at Marlboro', on Friday evening, Oct. 30, 1840. Notice had been given that Mr. St. Clair would give us two Lectures. Mr. St. Clair began by stating that his object was to state to us the reason why there had been a separation from the old State Society, and the reasons why a new State Society had been formed. Towards the close of his lecture he spoke in the highest terms of the flourishing prospects of the new organization going on in this State. He said he and Mr. Tracy, (the two State Agents) could not attend to near all the calls made to them for lectures, &c.—He said they were really in want of more agents to assist them—ought to have two more. He said they were in great need of a Baptist agent, to go to some towns where Baptist influence prevailed. He said a Baptist agent must be procured. He said he had been very successful in collecting funds; mentioned several towns, and the sums collected in them. Still, he said, the new Society was in great need of funds. He said he understood that Mr. Grosvenor and Dr. Batcheller had, some one or two years since, pledged themselves to collect ten dollars, and pay into the Treasury of the old Society.—He said that pledge ought to be redeemed. He said he wanted funds to procure the Baptist Agent, and that such an agent must be procured, if possible. He said their paper, the Abolition Standard, did not support itself—that more subscriptions must be procured. He wished the friends of the cause in this place would use every possible exertion to procure subscriptions.

He said he hoped they would double the amount they might hitherto have given; that one dollar, he could assure them, would do more good, if given now, than two had ever before done, or probably would ever hereafter do—that many were anxious to join the new society, who would not join the old—they were in numerous places only waiting for Agents to come and form societies. He said he had now eight or nine calls to go to places. As soon as he had closed, he called on those who had subscription papers to go round and take up subscriptions. Subscription papers had been given to several individuals before the lecture begun.—Here Dr. Batcheller rose and desired permission to make some remarks. Mr. St. Clair said that the gentleman should have liberty to speak after they had got through taking the subscriptions. Dr. Batcheller said he was anxious to make what remarks he had to say before the subscriptions were taken. Mr. St. Clair repeated again that he should have liberty after the subscriptions. Dr. Batcheller said he would not occupy their time more than ten minutes—but if he must be gagged, he would sit down and submit to it. He said the audience had heard but one side of the question—he said, when one lawyer had made his plea, and stated all he had to say in favor of his side of the question, he did not think it looked fair or candid for the jury to rise and say, we are now satisfied—we are now ready to render our verdict. Dr. B. said, as he was not permitted to state his side of the question, he considered himself gagged, and would sit down.

After the subscription papers had been passed round, Mr. St. Clair said that Dr. Batcheller then had liberty to make remarks. Dr. B. then made some remarks in favor of the old Society—said he belonged to the old organization—that his sympathies were with them—that the Treasury of the old society was empty—that their paper, the Herald of Freedom, was in need of support as much as the Abolition Standard—that the reason why he was so anxious to speak before the subscription was taken, was, that probably there were some present who, if they could hear both sides of the question fairly stated, before they subscribed, would be as willing to subscribe for the old society as for the new. As there were two parties, he thought both ought to have an equal chance. Here Mr. Grosvenor rose and said, that the subscriptions just taken were to be appropriated, in the first place, to pay the ten dollars pledge made by him and Dr. Batcheller to the old society. Dr. B. said he did not understand it so, if he had he should have been the first to subscribe. He said he could not believe the audience understood it so. Dr. B. asked Mr. Jeremiah Herrick, who sat in the same pew with Dr. B., if he understood that the subscriptions taken that evening were to go towards paying the ten dollars pledge? Mr. Herrick said he did not so understand it. Mr. Grosvenor and Mr. St. Clair both then stated that to be the fact.—Mr. St. Clair said he so stated in the first place. Dr. B. said if that was their meaning, he would go and sign the subscription. Mr. St. Clair said, Doctor, better late than never—come and subscribe. We can all work substraction—the ten dollars shall be taken out first, or can easily be taken out.

Marlboro,' Oct. 31, 1840.

Jeremiah Herrick,	Joseph Cuming,
Silas Collater,	Asahel Collins,
Nelson Converse,	Reuben Ward,
Ziba Nason.	

Messrs. G., St. C. and myself, held a long conversation after the people left the house—we examined the subscription papers, and found over four dollars. Mr. St. C. said he understood my family had lately contributed to the old society something like five dollars, (9) and that it ought to be charged to the old society, and be reckoned towards paying our ten dollars pledge. I explained to him that Mrs. Batcheller sent to the Ladies Fair, held at Concord, a few articles as a present, of but small amount, with a line stating that she had sent them a small present, as a pledge of her attachment to the cause. She soon received from Mrs. Pillsbury a letter of acknowledgement. But AFTER this explanation Mr. St. C. strenuously insisted that I ought to charge the society with it, and make them allow it towards our ten dollars pledge(10)—and that Mr. G. and myself were bound only to make up the remainder. This absurdity—the ridiculous light in which it would have placed Mrs. Batcheller and myself—all can judge. If Mr. G. *had any hand* in this insulting proposition, I will do him the justice to say he did not attempt to advocate it before me. I need not say that I declined the proposition. Mr. G. asked me if I would not try to get more subscriptions towards paying the ten dollars, as there were not quite five dollars on the subscription papers. I told him I would, and he agreed to do the same(11)—and under this agreement we left the house. Now I ask, how did the facts stand at this stage, as testified by Mr. Herrick and others? Under what solemn public agreement did we all return home that evening? Mr. G. and Mr. St. C. solemny promised, before the whole audience, that the subscriptions on the table should go towards paying the ten dollars pledge—they repeated it emphatically twice or three times.(12) What did they do in the morning? Did they keep their word? No! not in the least—they completely nullified it, and this they own. Mr. St. C. wrote a new subscription, with an entirely different agreement. The new subscription paper requires the signers to pay what they subscribe into the treasury of the New-Hampshire Abolition Society, or to its agents, and the treasurer or agent is to take out of the sum five dollars, and pay it to the old society, for the purpose of paying Mr. Grosvenor's share of the old ten dollars pledge. (13) Who would have expected such duplicity—such a total disregard of a solemn promise, made only ten hours before?—Would any have expected it from those who teach others to practice the pure principles of religion and morality?(14) And how did they continue to justify their disregard of their solemn promise? They say—I quote their own words—that, "as a dispute had arisen in the meeting in relation to the appropriation of the subscription, some understanding that the above pledge was to be redeemed out of it, and others that it was not."(15) Now I contend the above reason is altogether false—there was no 'dispute,' after Messrs. Grosvenor and St. C. explained(16) where the money pledged was to go. They both interrupted me when making remarks about the poverty of the old society, by telling me, and repeating it, that the subscription then on the table was to go towards paying the ten dollars pledge. This they declared before the assembly, the subscribers being present, and not one objected to their explanation. Why this miserable attempt to screen themselves, by insinuating that there was a misunderstanding?—How could there be any dispute or misunderstanding after all heard their explanation? I charge Mr. G. and St. C. of depriving me of half of what was collected that evening. (17) I further complain, that Mr. G. has broken the pledge we mutually made at Concord.(18)

And now to prove that the reason assigned for breaking their promise is false, I call your attention to the following note addressed to me by Mr. St. C. the morning after his lecture.

"*To Dr. J. Batcheller.*

DEAR SIR—

In view of the interruption made, and subscription prevented by *you* last evening, it has been thought advisable to give up what was then made, and commence anew. I therefore return the paper on which is your name. Very respectfully,

A. ST. CLAIR."

The paper on which he wrote this note, was the same on which I subscribed. Now I ask the reader to notice that Mr. St. C., by his own sign manual, contradicts(19) the statement set forth in the publication, about a dispute or misunderstanding, &c., &c.(20) Mr. Grosvenor told me the reason why St. C. wrote a new subscription was, because there was a misunderstanding at the meeting. This he told me after I received the above letter from Mr. St. Clair. Now I ask them to reconcile these two contradictory statements. Did Mr. St. Clair tell Mr. Grosvenor the *truth* when he said it was on account of a misunderstanding? If so, the statement of St. C. in his note to me is false. I am charged of making unfavorable statements at Keene. I did show the statements signed by respectable citizens of Marlboro,' (21) and I am ready to prove every statement made at Keene, and also in this communication.(22) I know my witnesses. I wish to state—that if the signers of the publication, to which this is a reply, designed any injury to me, I freely forgive them, on account of the many mitigating circumstances. I will hazard the assertion, that the three men who signed it never wrote it, nor FIRST suggested to have such a statement published. Furthermore, I believe it was Mr. Grosvenor, with the assistance of St. Clair, and perhaps, also, Mrs. G.

I do not believe the manuscript was read to them more than once; and, as the article was long, and contained a great many statements, some of which must have been *new* to these three signers, I think they could not be supposed to have had a very distinct understanding of what they signed. It is somewhat strange to me that these persons should have suffered themselves to be the medium through which Mr. G. and St. C. could hurl their invectives at me. The time will come when these men will deeply regret their agency in assisting to injure a neighbor who has ever been ready, and still is, to bestow on them acts of kindness. I close by saying to Messrs. Grosvenor and St. Clair, that they will find it difficult to erect a breast-work of sufficient height to protect them, while hurling their darts at me.(22) The blunt and broken points of their arrows, clearly point out the archers who spring the bow.

JAMES BATCHELLER.

(*Concluded next week.*)

MISCELLANY.

Agricultural.

We clip from the Yankee Farmer a few items of the report of the agricultural meeting in the State House, last week.

Col. *Joques*, of Charlestown. I would not dictate, but state my experience. In breeding stock, my object was to produce animals suited to the climate and soil of New England. I commenced in 1819, and admiring some of the points, and general character of the Durham short horns, and thinking to improve it, so as to adapt it to our climate, I searched for the best cow of our native breed. At length, I found one, from Groton, having more good properties and points than any other. She resembled the Devon breed. She was red, like the Durham, but this was the only thing in which she was like the Durham; but she had good points.

The first calf from this cow, by a fine Durham short horned bull, was a cow-calf, which gave 16 quarts of good milk per day, when she had the first calf, at two years old, and from this stock I now have 60 animals. I go for blood-stock. I will breed animals to order, in color or forms, as a mechanic would procure pails, or any other article in his line. if black be wanted, it shall be done. If large rumps and small shins be desired, the order shall be executed. This is important; in the market, the rump brings much more per pound. I got my notions of breeding from Jacob.

My grand object was to get a breed that would produce rich milk. Four quarts of the last milking of one cow, has produced 1 lb. of butter, and the churning has been done in one minute. I used to feed high, as the short horns were supposed to require high keeping. Now, I feed only on grass and hay. From the best cows, 100 lbs. of cream will make 95 lbs. of butter, and the churning can be done in 1 or 1 1-2 minutes. I prefer deep red or mahogany color. The true principles of breeding will be well understood bye and bye—twenty years hence they will be as familiar as railroads. I judge of a good animal by the touch. Would rather be blindfold than have my hands tied behind me in forming an opinion. The finest cattle have an elastic, silky touch. Some say that I have oiled my cattle.

Mr. *Sheldon*, of Wilmington. In selecting good working cattle, choose those with long, lean faces; if you would have cattle that travel and pull freely, those with short faces start quick, and soon forget the whip. I choose oxen with sharp eyes, long heads, and pleasant in their looks. Black eyed oxen are not docile, and cannot be relied on. In making a selection, I would depend as much on the eye of an ox, as on that of a man. I prefer oxen with full bosoms, as this mark is an indication of strength. The toes of cattle should be straight foreward, in order to travel well. If they incline outward, there will be a strain upon the inner claw. Oxen should have straight legs, as they have to bear a great weight on their four legs. A crooked stick will not support so much weight as a straight one. Oxen with long pointed feet are not good travellers. Large ancles should be avoided. For cattle that will endure hardships, I should choose those with rounded and projecting ribs, so that they would not hit their hips in running among trees.

I prefer oxen that are trained young. The oxen from Maine, which are trained young, will perform more labor than those from New-Hampshire and Vermont, which are not trained so early. This training should commence when they are calves, but the labor proportioned to their strength. Exercise and exposure, in a proper degree, produce strength and ability to bear hardships.

If there be one leak in a ship, one gap in a wall, one gate in a city, unprovided for it is enough to sink a ship, to drown a country, to betray a city. One little boy thrust in at a window can unlock the door for all the rest of the thieves. It was but one Jonah that raised a tempest, but one Achan that troubled a camp, and one sin generally unrepented of, were enough to undermine a kingdom. Bp Reynolds.

WOMAN. The affection of woman is the most wonderful thing in the world; it tires not—faints not—dreads not—cools not. It is like the Naptha that nothing can extinguish but the trampling foot of death.—***

The Britannia sailed from Liverpool on the 4th, and arrived in Boston harbor on the morning of the 22d, at 7 o'clock—bringing 28 days later news from England. On the day after leaving England she broached to, stove her bulwarks and broke her iron tiller short off. She has had a very rough passage, the weather having been boisterous in the extreme. She has made her passage in 17 1-4 days.

It is confidently stated that the names selected for the Princess Royal are Adelaide Victoria Louise.

The Cambridge Advertiser says that rumors were prevalent in that neighborhood, that upwards of a hundred lives had been lost by breaking in of the ice.

The Moniteur of Monday officially announces Mehomet Ali's unconditional surrender of the Turkish fleet to Admiral Walker on the 14th ult.

DEATH OF THE AMERICAN CONSUL IN FRANCE. Died on Sunday evening, Jan. 31, in Paris, in the 68th year of his age, of typhoid exhaustion after gout, Daniel Brent, Esq., Consul of the United States of America for Paris, and agent of Americans claims.

By the dreadful shipwreck of the Thames steamer, on her voyge from Dublin to London, on the 3d ult, it is ascertained that out of sixty-five passengers only four were saved.

A report was current in London on the third inst. that Chuson had been retaken by the Chinese, and that two British ships had been burned.

Force of Habit. Mr. Hazard, of West Greenwich, has been in a habit, for a number of years, of uniformly voting against Mr. Simmons sent in his resignation as a member of the House; and, upon the question of accepting the same, which was put as a matter of form, Mr. Hazard could not resist the temptation to give one more against his old opponent, and accordingly audibly responded *no.*—*Providence Journal.*

Indiana Abolition Movements. The correspondent of the New-Albany Gazette, writing from Indianapolis, under date of the 19th ult., stated that there was then a bill before the Senate (which had passed the House of Representatives by a large majority,) securing the right of trial by injury to fugitive slaves. In the Senate, on the 29th ult., the bill was indefinitely postponed by a vote of 22 to 18—only 4 majority! *Louisville (Ky.) Adv.*

From the Coast of Africa. We learn from a New Orleans paper, that the two great slave factories of Don Pedro Blanco and Don Pedro Martmez had been broken up by the crew of a British man-of-war. Goods to the amount of half a million of dollars had been destroyed, and 1500 negroes set at liberty. These figures are no doubt exaggerated.

More Steamers. The Boston Post states that Mr. Cunard has determined to establish a weekly line of steamers to play between the two continents. The new ships will be better calculated for the conveyance of freight than the present ones.

Hiram Wilson says that about one thousand colored Americans have emigrated to Canada the past year! being a loss to the slaveholders of at least seven hundred thousand dollars. There is a prospect that the Government will soon give lands to the emigrants.

At the late Northampton (Eng.) Assizes, John Pridmore was found guilty of flinging his aged father, with whom he had quarrelled, into a horse-pond, with intent to drown him. The dutiful youth had previously sold his wife, and threatened the life of his mother.

The New-Haven Register says: 'Perhaps it is not generally known, that any citizen intending to travel in Europe, can procure a passport free of charge, from Washington. He has but to leave the necessary directions with a Collector or Postmaster, and it is their duty to procure the document.

The Knox Presbytery, Ill., have renewed their sentence of exclusion of slaveholders from the communion and pulpit, and remonstrated warmly against the time-serving course pursued by the (constitutional) General Assembly of their church.

The public generally may not be aware that a number of Banks are closing their concerns, and after a certain period their bills will cease to be redeemed. We refer to the Fulton, Commercial, American, Hancock, Kilby, and Oriental Banks, at Boston; Norfolk, at Roxbury; Middlesex, at Cambridge; Windsor at Windsor; Montpelier, at Montpelier; East Bridgewater, at East Bridgewater. We therefore recommend to the public to forward for payment what bills they may have of those banks, before the time expires.—*Boston Atlas.*

PERSONAL DISTINCTIONS. Personal distinctions arising from superior probity, learning, eloquence, skill, courage and from every other excellency of talents, are the very nerves of the body politic; they animate the whole, and invigorate every part; without them its bones would become reeds, and its marow waters; it would presently sink into a fætid, senseless mass of corruption. [Bishop Watson.

THE HUMAN HEART. The human heart revolts against oppression, and is soothed by gentleness, as the wave of the ocean rise in proportion to the violence of the winds, and sink with the breeze, into mildness and serenity. [Casket.

MISERY. If misery be the effects of virtue, it ought to be reverenced; if of ill fortune, to be pitied; and if of vice, not to be insulted; because it is, perhaps, itself a punishment adequate to the crime by which it was produced; and the humanity of that man can deserve no panegyric, who is capable of reproaching a criminal in the hands of an executioner. [Johnson.